

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Ambassador Robert Martin, Ingersoll Sui Juris,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civ. No. 05-1059 (JNE/RLE)
ORDER

State of Minnesota [Sued as a Person],
State of Maine [Sued as a Person],
State of New Hampshire [Sued as a Person],
State of Vermont [Sued as a Person],
State of New York [Sued as a Person],
State of Massachusetts [Sued as a Person],
State of Connecticut [Sued as a Person],
State of Rhode Island [Sued as a Person],
State of Delaware [Sued as a Person],
State of New Jersey [Sued as a Person],
State of Maryland [Sued as a Person],
State of Pennsylvania [Sued as a Person],
State of Michigan [Sued as a Person],
State of Wisconsin [Sued as a Person],
State of Kentucky [Sued as a Person],
State of Kansas [Sued as a Person],
State of California [Sued as a Person],
State of Illinois [Sued as a Person],
State of Iowa [Sued as a Person],
State of Missouri [Sued as a Person],
State of Oregon [Sued as a Person],
State of Ohio [Sued as a Person],
Constitution of United States Amendment XI,
Constitution of United States Amendment XIV,
Constitution of United States Amendment XVI,
Constitution of United States Amendment XVII,

Defendants.

In a Report and Recommendation dated October 6, 2005, the Honorable Raymond L. Erickson, Chief United States Magistrate Judge, recommended that the Complaint be dismissed. On October 24, 2005, a document captioned "Affidavit of Truth of Facts and Status" was filed. The document is signed by "Ambassador Robert Martin, Ingersoll Sui Juris Claimant." The

document does not appear to comply with Rule 6(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 1.1(f) of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, or Rule 72.2(b) of the Local Rules. The Court construes this pro se filing as an objection to the Report and Recommendation. Having reviewed and attempted to make sense of the “affidavit,” the Court is satisfied that the magistrate judge accurately stated the law. The Court adopts the Report and Recommendation. Therefore, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The Plaintiff’s Motions for Entry of Default [Docket Nos. 48 and 59] are DENIED.
2. The Plaintiff’s Motions for a Hearing [Docket Nos. 28 and 44] are DENIED AS MOOT, as a Hearing was conducted on September 15, 2005.
3. The Motions to Dismiss of the Defendants State of Kansas [Docket No. 6], State of Michigan [Docket No. 12], State of New Jersey [Docket No. 19], State of Ohio [Docket No. 24], and State of Oregon [Docket No. 36] are GRANTED, and the Plaintiff’s Complaint is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.
4. The Plaintiff’s Complaint is DISMISSED as to all of the Defendants, as the Court is without subject matter jurisdiction to consider the claims raised in the Complaint.

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: November 1, 2005

s/ Joan N. Ericksen
JOAN N. ERICKSEN
United States District Judge